

NILPOTENCY OF ELEMENTARY OPERATORS ON $B(E)$

GYAN PRAKASH TRIPATHI^{*,1} AND NAND LAL

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS

SGR PG COLLEGE, DOBHI

JAUNPUR – 222149,INDIA

1/89 VINAY KHAND,GOMATI NAGAR

LUCKNOW-222460,INDIA

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we shall give a necessary and sufficient condition for nilpotency of elementary multiplication operators and some sufficient conditions for elementary operators to be nilpotent on $B(E)$, where E is Banach space.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $B(E)$ be the algebra of all bounded linear operators on a Banach space E , and let $A = (A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n)$ and $B = (B_1, B_2, \dots, B_n)$ be two n -tuples of operators in $B(E)$. The elementary operator $R_{A,B}$ associated with A and B is the operator on $B(E)$ into itself defined by

$$R_{A,B}(X) = A_1XB_1 + A_2XB_2 + \dots + A_nXB_n$$

for all $X \in B(E)$ (see [1]).

For A and B in $B(E)$, by $M_{A,B}$ we denote elementary multiplication operator defined by $M_{A,B}(X) = AXB$ for all $X \in B(E)$. This can also be seen as elementary operator of length one. For $A, B \in B(E)$, inner derivation δ_A on $B(E)$ into itself is defined by $\delta_A(X) = AX - XA$ and generalized derivation $\delta_{A,B}$ on $B(E)$ into itself is defined by $\delta_{A,B}(X) = AX - XB$ for all $X \in B(E)$. It is easy to see that generalized derivation and inner derivation are particular cases of elementary operators.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 47B47.

Key words and phrases. Commuting families, elementary operators, generalized derivations, nilpotency.

*E-mail: gptbhu@yahoo.com.

In 1979, Fong and Sourour [2] investigated the compactness of elementary operators. By using that result they gave the following characterization of nilpotency of generalized derivations.

Theorem 1.1. [2] *Let X be an infinite dimensional Banach space and $S, T \in B(X)$, then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $\delta_{S,T}$ is nilpotent.
- (2) There exist a positive integer n such that $\delta_{S,T}^n$ is a compact operator.
- (3) There exist a scalar λ such that $S - \lambda I$ and $T - \lambda I$ are nilpotent.

2. RESULTS

In this section, we shall give a necessary and sufficient condition for nilpotency of elementary operators and give some sufficient conditions for elementary operators to be nilpotent.

Theorem 2.1. *The elementary multiplication operator $M_{A,B}(X) = AXB$ for all $X \in B(E)$, is nilpotent if and only if either A or B is nilpotent.*

Proof. We have $M_{A,B}(X) = AXB$ for all $X \in B(E)$ so $M_{A,B}^n(X) = A^n X B^n$. It is easy to see that $M_{A,B}$ is nilpotent if either A or B is nilpotent.

Conversely, let $M_{A,B}^n = 0$. Now $M_{A,B}^n(X) = A^n X B^n = 0$ for all $X \in B(E)$. If B is nilpotent then theorem is done otherwise $B^n z \neq 0$ for some $z \in E$. By consequence of Hahn - Banach theorem there exist a linear functional f such that $f(B^n z) \neq 0$. Let $f \otimes x$ be rank one operator on E defined by $(f \otimes x)(z) = f(z)x$, where x is a nonzero vector in E (see [3]).

Now

$$\begin{aligned} A^n(f \otimes x)B^n &= 0 \quad \Rightarrow A^n(f \otimes x)B^n z = 0 \\ &\Rightarrow f(B^n z)A^n x = 0 \\ &\Rightarrow A^n x = 0. \end{aligned}$$

If we vary x throughout E , then $A^n x = 0$ for all $x \in E$. Hence A is nilpotent. $\square$

Theorem 2.2. *Let $R_{A,B}$ be an elementary operator on $B(E)$, where $A = (A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n)$ and $B = (B_1, B_2, \dots, B_n)$ are n -tuples of commuting families in $B(E)$. Then $R_{A,B}$ is nilpotent if either A_i or B_i is nilpotent for each $1 \leq i \leq n$.*

Proof. We denote $R_{AB}(X) = \sum_{i=1}^n A_i X B_i$, for all $X \in B(E)$.

For $n = 1$, $R_{A,B}$ is an elementary multiplication operator. Therefore statement is true by Theorem 2.1

Suppose statement is true for $n = m$.

Now we show that statement is true for $n = m + 1$ also.

Let

$$\begin{aligned} R_{A,B}(X) &= \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} A_i X B_i \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m A_i X B_i + A_{m+1} X B_{m+1} \end{aligned}$$

Suppose $R'_{A,B}(X) = \sum_{i=1}^m A_i X B_i$ and $M_{A_{m+1}, B_{m+1}}(X) = A_{m+1} X B_{m+1}$. It follows that $R_{A,B} = R'_{A,B} + M_{A_{m+1}, B_{m+1}}$. Since A_i 's and B_i 's are commuting, it is easy to see that $R'_{A,B} M_{A_{m+1}, B_{m+1}} = M_{A_{m+1}, B_{m+1}} R'_{A,B}$. But $R'_{A,B}$ and $M_{A_{m+1}, B_{m+1}}$ are nilpotent. Therefore $R_{A,B}(X) = \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} A_i X B_i$ is nilpotent. $\square$

Theorem 2.3. *Let $V_{A,B}(X) = AXB - BXA$ be an elementary operator on $B(H)$ into itself, where $AB = BA$. If there exist $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{C}$, such that $A - \lambda I$ and $B - \mu I$ are nilpotent then $V_{A,B}$ is nilpotent.*

Proof. We have $V_{A,B}(X) = AXB - BXA$. It is easy to see that

$$V_{A-\lambda I, B-\mu I}(X) = V_{A,B}(X) + \lambda \delta_B(X) - \mu \delta_A(X) \quad (2.1)$$

Since $A - \lambda I$ and $B - \mu I$ are nilpotent, δ_A and δ_B are nilpotent follows by Theorem 1.1. Further $\delta_A \delta_B = \delta_B \delta_A$. Therefore $\lambda \delta_B - \mu \delta_A$ is nilpotent. Note that $V_{A-\lambda I, B-\mu I}$ is nilpotent by Theorem 2.2. Since $AB = BA$, it is easy to see that

$V_{A-\lambda I, B-\mu I}(\mu \delta_A - \lambda \delta_B) = (\mu \delta_A - \lambda \delta_B) V_{A-\lambda I, B-\mu I}$. Therefore from equation (2.1) $V_{A,B} = V_{A-\lambda I, B-\mu I} + \mu \delta_A - \lambda \delta_B$ is nilpotent. $\square$

3. EXAMPLES

Example 3.1. Let $\mathcal{A} = M_2(\mathbb{C})$ be the complex algebra of all 2×2 matrices and let

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Note that $AB \neq BA$, $A^2 = B^2 = 0$, $ABA = A$ and $BAB = B$. Consider $V_{A,B}(X) = AXB - BXA$, we get $V_{A,B}^3 = -V_{A,B}$.

But $V_{A,B}(X) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_{22} & 0 \\ 0 & -\mathbf{x}_{11} \end{bmatrix}$ is a diagonal operator for every $X \in M_2(\mathbb{C})$, where $X = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_{11} & \mathbf{x}_{12} \\ \mathbf{x}_{21} & \mathbf{x}_{22} \end{bmatrix}$. Therefore $V_{A,B}^3 = -V_{A,B} \neq 0$. Hence $V_{A,B}$ is not nilpotent.

Above example shows that commutativity of A and B cannot be relaxed in Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 2.3.

Example 3.2. Let $\mathcal{A} = M_3(\mathbb{C})$ be the complex algebra of all 3×3 matrices. Suppose

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} a & b & 1 \\ c & d & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & k \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } B = \begin{bmatrix} a & b & 0 \\ c & d & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & k \end{bmatrix} \text{ such that } a + b = c + d = k \neq 0, b + c \neq 0.$$

Note that $AB = BA$ and $N = A - B$ is nilpotent. Consider $V_{A,B}(X) = AXB - BXA$, we have $V_{A,B}(X) = NXB - BNX$. Thus $V_{A,B}$ is nilpotent by Theorem 2.2 but none of A or B is nilpotent. This shows that condition of Theorem 2.1 cannot be extended to elementary operators of length 2. This example also shows that converse of Theorem 2.2 is not true. Further note that $A - \lambda I$ and $B - \mu I$ are not nilpotent for any $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{C}$. This shows that converse of Theorem 2.3 is not true.

Acknowledgement:

Research work of first author is supported by CSIR Award No.9/13(951)/2000-EMR-I Dated 19.12.2002. The helpful suggestions of referee are also gratefully acknowledged.

REFERENCES

- [1] L.A. Fialkow: Structural properties of elementary operators, *Elementary Operators & Applications*, (Editor. Martin Mathieu), 44-113, World Scientific. 1992.
- [2] C.K. Fong and A.R. Sourour : On the operator identity $\sum A_k X B_k = 0$, *Canad. J. Math.* 31 No.4 (1979), 845-857.
- [3] G.J. Murphy: *C*-algebras and Operator Theory*, Academic Press, New York, 1990.